UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Shifra Gordon,	individually	and on	behalf	of all	others
similarly situat	ed,				

Plaintiffs,

Civil Action No:	
------------------	--

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

-v.-

United Collection Bureau, Inc., and John Does 1-25

Defendant.

Plaintiff Shifra Gordon (hereinafter, "Plaintiff"), a New York resident, brings this Class Action Complaint by and through her attorneys, Stein Saks, PLLC, against Defendant United Collection Bureau, Inc., and John Does 1-25 (hereinafter "Defendant UCB") individually and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, based upon information and belief of Plaintiff's counsel, except for allegations specifically pertaining to Plaintiff, which are based upon Plaintiff's personal knowledge.

INTRODUCTION/PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. Congress enacted the FDCPA in 1977 in response to the "abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors." 15 U.S.C. §1692(a). At that time, Congress was concerned that "abusive debt collection practices contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to material instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." *Id.* Congress concluded that "existing laws...[we]re inadequate to protect consumers," and that "the effective collection of debts' does not require 'misrepresentation or other abusive debt collection practices." 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692(b) & (c).

2. Congress explained that the purpose of the Act was not only to eliminate abusive debt collection practices, but also to "insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged." ld. § 1692(e). After determining that the existing consumer protection laws ·were inadequate. Id. § 1692(b), Congress gave consumers a private cause of action against debt collectors who fail to comply with the Act. Id. § 1692k.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. The Court has jurisdiction over this class action pursuant to <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § <u>1331</u>, <u>15 U.S.C.</u> § <u>1692</u> et. seq. and <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § <u>2201</u>. If applicable, the Court also has pendant jurisdiction over the State law claims in this action pursuant to <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § <u>1367(a)</u>.
 - 4. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 5. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of a class of New York consumers under§ 1692 et seq. of Title 15 of the United States Code, commonly referred to as the Fair Debt Collections Practices Act ("FDCPA").
 - 6. Plaintiff is seeking damages and declaratory and injunctive relief.

PARTIES

- Plaintiff is a resident of the State of New York, County of Rockland, residing at 23
 Zitomer St., Spring Valley, NY 10977.
 - 2. Defendant UCB is a "debt collector" as the phrase is defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692(a)(6) and used in the FDCPA with an address at 5620 Southwyck Blvd, Toledo, OH 43614.

- 3. Upon information and belief, Defendant is a company that uses the mail, telephone, and facsimile and regularly engages in business the principal purpose of which is to attempt to collect debts alleged to be due another.
- 4. Defendant is a "debt collector" as defined under the FDCPA under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).
- 5. John Does 1-25, are fictitious names of individuals and businesses alleged for the purpose of substituting names of Defendants whose identities will be disclosed in discovery and should be made parties to this action.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

- 6. Plaintiffs bring this claim on behalf of the following case, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(3).
 - 7. The Class consists of:
 - a. all individuals with addresses in the State of New York;
 - b. to whom Defendant UCB sent a collection letter attempting to collect a consumer debt;
 - c. that falsely stated that any forgiveness of \$600 or more may be reported to the IRS on a 1099C Form;
 - d. which letter was sent on or after a date one (1) year prior to the filing of this action and on or before a date twenty-one (2l) days after the filing of this action.
- 8. The identities of all class members are readily ascertainable from the records of Defendants and those companies and entitles on whose behalf they attempt to collect and/or have purchased debts.
- 9. Excluded from the Plaintiff Classes are the Defendants and all officer, members, partners, managers, directors and employees of the Defendants and their respective immediate

families, and legal counsel for all parties to this action, and all members of their immediate families.

- 10. There are questions of law and fact common to the Plaintiff Classes, which common issues predominate over any issues involving only individual class members. The principal issue is whether the Defendants' written communications to consumers, in the forms such as the case at hand, violate 15 U.S.C. §1692e and §1692f.
- 11. The Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the class members, as all are based upon the same facts and legal theories. The Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Plaintiff Classes defined in this complaint. The Plaintiffs have retained counsel with experience in handling consumer lawsuits, complex legal issues, and class actions, and neither the Plaintiffs nor her attorneys have any interests, which might cause them not to vigorously pursue this action.
- 12. This action has been brought, and may properly be maintained, as a class action pursuant to the provisions of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because there is a well-defined community interest in the litigation:
 - a. <u>Numerosity:</u> The Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that the Plaintiff Classes defined above are so numerous that joinder of all members would be impractical.
 - b. <u>Common Questions Predominate:</u> Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Plaintiff Classes and those questions predominance over any questions or issues involving only individual class members. The principal issue is whether the Defendants' written communications to consumers, in the forms such as in this matter violate 15 U.S.C. §1692e and §1692f.

- c. <u>Typicality:</u> The Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the class members.

 The Plaintiffs and all members of the Plaintiff Classes have claims arising out of the Defendants' common uniform course of conduct complained of herein.
- d. Adequacy: The Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class members insofar as Plaintiffs have no interests that are adverse to the absent class members. The Plaintiffs are committed to vigorously litigating this matter. Plaintiffs have also retained counsel experienced in handling consumer lawsuits, complex legal issues, and class actions. Neither the Plaintiffs nor her counsel have any interests which might cause them not to vigorously pursue the instant class action lawsuit.
- e. <u>Superiority:</u> A class action is superior to the other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because individual joinder of all members would be impracticable. Class action treatment will permit a large number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum efficiently and without unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that individual actions would engender.
- 13. Certification of a class under Rule 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is also appropriate in that the questions of law and fact common to members of the Plaintiff Classes predominate over any questions affecting an individual member, and a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.
- 14. Depending on the outcome of further investigation and discovery, Plaintiffs may, at the time of class certification motion, seek to certify a class(es) only as to particular issues pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(4).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered above herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
- 16. Some time prior to June 19, 2020, an obligation was allegedly incurred to Fifth Third Bank, N.A.
- 17. The Fifth Third Bank, N.A. obligation arose out of transactions in which money, property, insurance or services, which are the subject of the transaction, are primarily for personal, family or household purposes.
- 18. The alleged Fifth Third Bank, N.A. obligation is a "debt" as defined by 15 U.S.C.§ 1692a(5).
 - 19. Fifth Third Bank, N.A. is a "creditor" as defined by 15 U.S.C.§ 1692a(4).
- 20. Fifth Third Bank, N.A. contracted with Defendant UCB, a debt collector who is attempting to collect the alleged debt.
- 21. Defendant collects and attempts to collect debts incurred or alleged to have been incurred for personal, family or household purposes on behalf of creditors using the United States Postal Services, telephone and internet.

Violation

22. On or about June 19, 2020, Defendant sent the Plaintiff a collection letter (the "Letter"), hereto attached as Exhibit A, regarding the alleged debt.

- 23. The letter proposes a settlement offer and states the following: "Please be advised that, except in certain in certain limited circumstances, FIFTH THIRD BANK, N.A. is required to report the forgiveness of any debt of \$600.00 or more to the Internal Revenue Service. You should consult a tax professional with any questions and to learn how this might affect you."
- 24. The letter fails to disclose to consumers that there is a distinction between principal and interest in regards to IRS requirements.
- 25. Under 26 C.F.R. §§2.6050P-1(d)(2) and (3), only the discharge of principal need be reported:
 - (2) Interest. The discharge or an amount of indebtedness that is interest **is not** required to be reported under this section.
 - (3) Non-principal amounts in lending transactions. In the case of a lending transaction, the discharge of an amount other than stated principal **is not required to be reported** under this section. For this purpose, a lending transaction is any transaction in which a lender loans money to, or makes advances on behalf of, a borrower (including revolving credits and lines of credit).
- 26. The language in the letter that "forgiveness of any debt" may be reported to the IRS could reasonably be understood by the least sophisticated consumer to mean that IRS regulations require that it report all forgiveness of debt.
- 27. Collection notices are deceptive if they are open to more than one reasonable interpretation, at least one of which is inaccurate.
- 28. Although Defendant had no duty to disclose any potential tax ramifications, when Defendant chooses to give tax disclosures, it must do so in a way that it will not mislead the least sophisticated consumer as to his or her tax consequences.

- 29. The Defendant's false statement invoking the Internal Revenue Service was misleading and deceptive in that it implies there is no distinction between principal and interest in regards to IRS requirements.
- 30. As a result of Defendant's deceptive, misleading and false debt collection practices, Plaintiff has been damaged.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT 15 U.S.C. §1692e et seq.

- 31. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs above herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
- 32. Defendants debt collection efforts attempted and/or directed towards the Plaintiff violated various provisions of the FDCPA, including but not limited to 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.
- 33. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692e, a debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.
 - 34. Defendants violated §1692e:
 - a. As the Letter it is open to more than one reasonable interpretation, at least one of which is inaccurate.
 - b. By making a false and misleading representation in violation of §1692e(10).
- 35. By reason thereof, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for judgment that Defendants conduct violated Section 1692e et seq. of the FDCPA, actual damages, statutory damages, costs and attorneys' fees.

COUNT II VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT 15 U.S.C. §1692f et seg.

- 36. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs above herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
- 37. Defendant's debt collection efforts attempted and/or directed towards the Plaintiff violated various provisions of the FDCPA, including but not limited to 15 U.S.C. § 1692f.
- 38. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692f, a debt collector may not use any unfair or unconscionable means in connection with the collection of any debt.
- 39. Defendant violated this section by misleading the Plaintiff with regards to the IRS reporting requirements.
- 40. By reason thereof, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for judgment that Defendant's conduct violated Section 1692f et seq. of the FDCPA, actual damages, statutory damages, costs and attorneys' fees.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

41. Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Shifra Gordon, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, demands judgment from Defendant UCB as follows:

- 1. Declaring that this action is properly maintainable as a Class Action and certifying Plaintiff as Class representative, and Raphael Deutsch, Esq. as Class Counsel;
 - 2. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class statutory damages;

- 3. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class actual damages;
- 4. Awarding Plaintiff costs of this Action, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses;
 - Awarding pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest; and 5.
- 6. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: July 24, 2020 Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Raphael Deutsch

Stein Saks, PLLC By: Raphael Deutsch

285 Passaic Street Hackensack, NJ 07601 Phone: (201) 282-6500

Fax: (201) 282-6501